

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
June 5, 2003

Members Present:

John Barrett
Ron Beguin
Janet Cornell
David Davis
Daniel Edwards
Joan Harphant
Karl Heckart
Carol Merfeld
Greg Obuch
Ellie Price
Will Tagart

Members Not Present:

Mohyeddin Abdulaziz
James Bondurant
Sue Castaneda
Kyle Rimel

Others Present:

William Earl
Gary Graham
Jennifer Greene
Maureen Haggerty
Paul Hrisho
Randy Kennedy
John King
Paul Hrisho
Rick Rager
Robert Roll

INTRODUCTIONS

Karl Heckart, the chair of the Technical Advisory Council, called the meeting to order at 9:30 a.m.

Statewide Initiatives Update

Karl noted that the budget was still unknown and therefore the Commission on Technology strategic planning session had been delayed until September. One of the purposes of this meeting was to come to agreement on those items TAC would be taking to the COT for consideration at that planning session.

Karl provided an update on various initiatives. He noted that the AOC had received and responded to legislative requests for information about on-going projects. He expected a legislative study group to be created to review court automation statewide, looking at coordination, standardization and compliance.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
June 5, 2003

He noted another budget-related coming project – the penalty enforcement program. The AOC is currently in the RFP evaluation process with responding vendors so Karl was not able to provide specifics; however, he did update members on the current thinking about the scope and direction of this statewide collections project.

Karl explained that there would be automated data transactions flowing from the courts to the collections vendor, from the vendor to the court and from both to DOR, MVD and maybe federal agencies as well. He said that we planned to leverage our JUSTIS infrastructure, including MQ messaging, to facilitate the flow of information. Some of the services expected to be included are courtesy notices which may pre-qualify defendants for defensive driving, an IVR and Web payment capability, delinquency noticing, near-real-time payment information flowing between vendor and courts, and use of both tax intercept and registration suspension enforcement.

Both AZTEC and non-AZTEC courts will be part of the pilot implementation. AZTEC will be enhanced to facilitate this collections effort. The details of the final contract and project plan for the pilot are expected to be available by the end of June. The intention is to simultaneously address the backlog of receivables while building a day-forward processing system. Cases in TIP that are not already assigned to other collection agencies may be a first step for aggressive collections efforts. Both statewide marketing and also closely coordinating with all courts on their A/R balances will be important parts of the project.

Bolt-On Modules Revisited

Members reviewed the Bolt-On matrix developed during the February meeting. Joan noted that there is a sense of urgency regarding adopting standards for development since her court and others would like to proceed with more development and want to assure coordination with the AOC. For a tool set, Karl noted that the direction we were going was using Visual Basic and migrating towards the .NET environment.

Members went through each item in the matrix, clarifying the categories and levels of support. The resulting revised matrix is included as an attachment to the minutes.

Concern was particularly voiced regarding the practical usability of the model. There were fears that the model would either encourage all or nothing responses; there may be no sharing because of the responsibilities of providing support and being the custodian of source code; on the other hand, courts would prefer to develop everything so it could become part of the core and therefore that role could be performed centrally. However, the latter usually takes more time because of the need for statewide participation. Various approval processes and scenarios were discussed.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
June 5, 2003

It was decided to pilot the process of developing a “bolt-on” communication and approval process and developing a checklist using Tucson Municipal Court’s planned sentencing module. Maureen was directed to work with Joan and report back to TAC in August on progress.

Members agreed that the goal of the model was to reduce the number of unprotected interfaces and encourage cooperation, coordination and sharing.

Security Manual Continued

Paul Hrisho noted that Sections 1 through 4 of the AJIN Security Manual distributed contained all revisions resulting from member and internal responses. He said that he was still revising the language, especially where provisions needed enforcement. He asked members to review the remaining sections of the manual and send comments to him (phrisho@supreme.sp.state.az.us). The Security Workgroup will be meeting during the summer to further discuss manual; Paul will assure that all members are notified of that meeting so they can participate.

Digital Recording

Maureen explained the variety of digital recording systems with proprietary formats that are being considered for courtroom use and noted that a standard would be advisable, especially since many are considered the original court record. Since some are provided to appeals courts, the multiple players, versions and formats over time may be unmanageable.

Members discussed the existing environment and the potential migration to different products. All agreed that the records retention schedule along with ACJA 1-506 were the guiding rules. It was also noted that a Gartner article, *Digitizing Media Assets: New Content, Familiar Challenge* by L. Latham (June 24, 2002), stated as follows:

For audio, the decision is fairly simple. The cleanest process is to encode all audio directly to disk as uncompressed >WAV files. These will have the highest quality and greatest flexibility for archiving, cataloging and indexing, and editing or post processing.

Based on this recommendation, members discussed/proposed:

- ❖ For courts of record, the permanent digital file should be in .WAV format.
- ❖ For records transmitted between courts, the digital file should be in .WAV format.
- ❖ For non-permanent-records (retention period of 10 years or less), courts may keep digital audio files in their working format as long as they retain the ability to provide the recording in .WAV format.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
June 5, 2003

Based on this proposed recommendation, technical review of current grant applications will require that any acquisition and implementation of digital audio recording be willing to adhere to this standard pending the adoption of a statewide court standard. A business and technical workgroup to explore this is recommended. COT will bring this concern to the attention of the Arizona Judicial Council.

Maricopa Superior Court is embarking on a project to centralize their digital audio records. They and members in courts with digital recording systems will try/explore the above recommendations and report impacts, concerns, etc. back to TAC in August, when another meeting is to be scheduled.

Next Year's Focus

Several topics were discussed as projects that may be undertaken during the next fiscal year. They included:

- ❖ Standards for electronic signatures. Some observations were:
 - That Maricopa Superior recently determined that an officer need not actually place a “wet signature” on Form IVs – a signature that was previously understood to be required.
 - That the context of signatures includes internal documents, documents sent out by the court, and documents received by the court from parties or agencies outside.
 - That this is more a business policy issue than a technology issue. Other statewide committees of AJC will have to be involved and legal research must be done.
- ❖ Standards for the import of electronic citation data (considering especially that we cannot standardize on a product that will be selected and used by law enforcement).
- ❖ Completion of the AJIN Security Manual
- ❖ Encryption
 - Of confidential email and document attachments.
 - Of confidential information transmitted via public networks to external agencies (e.g. transactions that contain social security number that are sent to DOR, MVD, and shortly, a collections vendor.
 - Of confidential information which may fall under HIPPA regulations.
- ❖ Digital Audio Recording
 - Continue research into recommended industry-wide standards
 - Work with business policy and record retention committees to come to a “best practices” recommendation.

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COUNCIL
A Subcommittee of the Commission on Technology
Minutes
June 5, 2003

Finalization of the issues and recommendations will be a topic at an August TAC meeting.

Other

Electronic Document Management Request for Proposal

The evaluation for EDMS vendors for the adopted software products is in process. Best and finals have been requested. A multiple vendor award will be desirable. The evaluation committee hopes to have contracts in place before the end of June.

Ad Hoc Reporting Software

Carol Merfeld reported on the Pima Superior Court effort to select an Ad Hoc reporting tool. They looked at products from 6 vendors. Four vendors participated in the final proof of concept demonstration by providing a Pima-specific application for dashboard and calendar.

The final selection was Brio. Carol provided a handout showing a comparison of Brio and Crystal Info, which is the current product in use statewide. The other vendor/products were Cognos and Actuate. In summary, it appeared that Brio has more sophisticated business analysis tools built into its product and this made for a more powerful and versatile tool. She will send William Earl more detailed information on the products and ballpark costs so the AOC can evaluate the impact of a migration. Carol noted that Brio can “leverage” any existing crystal report.

AOC Resource Commitments

Karl noted that when the collections project begins in the next few weeks, the AOC staff will be very focused on getting that up and running. He ask that all be aware of this anticipated shift if resources and hoped that members’ courts would also be refocusing on this, as well. Currently, the AOC is finalizing the vendor contract and a plan for the first 90 days to present at the June judicial conference.

Next Meeting

Karl said that members should expect an August meeting. Since the strategic planning meeting with COT will be in September, this group will want to agree on their priorities regarding technical pursuits and recommendations.

The regularly scheduled meetings for fiscal year 2004 are:

10/10/2003

12/12/2003

02/13/2004

04/09/2004

06/11/2004

MODEL FOR “BOLT-ON” MODULE DEVELOPMENT

FACTORS		MODULE CATEGORY				
		LOCAL INDEPENDENT	LOCAL COORDINATED	LEVERAGED	STANDARDIZED	CORE
	Definition:	Developed independently and state has no need to know about and no responsibility for	Developed independently but with knowledge of and in coordination with the state	Developed to share or acquired to become a function that multiple courts in a community of interest can use.	If a court wants the function, they will use this module.	Part of the CMS and fully supported and enhanced at the state level.
	Examples from existing known modules:		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noticing program in Tucson Muni 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rural MEEDS; FTA/FTP in Tucson Muni 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDMS vendor products – OnBase & Kofax • EDMS in-house built interfaces. • Jury+ • eCitation import & interface 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • File Tracking • PAM
1	AJIN security compliance with levels of compliance stratified where possible. (See AJIN Security Manual; required for all)	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

FACTORS		MODULE CATEGORY				
		LOCAL INDEPENDENT	LOCAL COORDINATED	LEVERAGED	STANDARDIZED	CORE
2	Architecture (hardware and software, development language and tools, operational environment; any programming or technical standards adopted by development group)	Local tools and standards	Local tools and standards	Constructed or tightly coupled with AOC adopted tools and standards if developed in-house; otherwise compatible vendor tools.	Constructed or tightly coupled with AOC adopted tools and standards if developed in-house; otherwise compatible vendor tools.	Constructed with AOC adopted tools and standards or a compatible vendor product.
3	Core program screen or code changes	No	No but negotiable if there is leverage potential.	Maybe the AOC may make and support minor changes to core image/code to provide for module	Yes – AOC will make and support some changes to provide for module.	Yes
4	Change management coordination (notices of changes; coordinating new releases of standard software image; coordinated testing and implementation planning)	No	Notice provided as part of release announcements.	Yes, with good faith effort to provide reasonable notice and implementation planning and coordination.	Yes and AOC participates in new release testing.	Yes

FACTORS		MODULE CATEGORY				
		LOCAL INDEPENDENT	LOCAL COORDINATED	LEVERAGED	STANDARDIZED	CORE
5	Database changes to Core DB (new tables or columns)	No	No but negotiable if there is leverage potential.	Maybe – AOC may change core DB to provide for a module	Yes – AOC will make and support some changes to provide for module	Yes
6	Help Desk (the 800 support desk)	Local	Local	Level 1 calls centralized to AOC (e.g. will take report and forward problem to designated support point)	Full AOC support for interface points. Level 1 calls centralized and AOC involvement in interface issues.	Yes
7	Interface/version protection (the interface between module and standard software will not be broken)	No	No but will provide notice of changes, and of impacts if known.	Coordinated with custodian or vendor contact.	Yes with agreement and planning on version change approaches and joint impact analysis.	Yes
8	Maintenance of the module	Local	Local	Appointed custodian among participants or a vendor.	Appointed custodian (or vendor) with AOC support.	AOC
9	Module (source code) owner – as “official version” source and version control	Local	Local	Selected custodian among participants	AOC	AOC

FACTORS		MODULE CATEGORY				
		LOCAL INDEPENDENT	LOCAL COORDINATED	LEVERAGED	STANDARDIZED	CORE
10	Module (source code) repository if not vendor-provided and/or in escrow.	Local	Local (AOC optional)	Selected custodian and AOC	AOC	AOC
11	Operational support (use of AOC technical staff for h/w or s/w support during operation of module)	No	No	Limited (e.g. troubleshooting, interface support)	Maybe – documented support model must be negotiated.	Yes
12	Part of standard desktop image/standard software installation	No	No	No	Candidate	Yes
13	Sharable	No; will not be distributed to others	No; will not be distributed to others.	Yes, with participant coordination; must be approved by AOC/COT	Yes; If vendor provided, must provide a support model.	Yes
14	Support Model Required (i.e. documentation on who supports and problem resolution steps)	No	No	Yes - Model is that a local contact or a vendor will support. Contact person and module information required for Help Desk.	Yes - Model and specifics of support documented.	AOC support via Help Desk and Service Level Agreements.

FACTORS		MODULE CATEGORY				
		LOCAL INDEPENDENT	LOCAL COORDINATED	LEVERAGED	STANDARDIZED	CORE
15	System Documentation	Local option	Local option	AOC as repository; Custodian maintains	AOC maintains	AOC maintains
16	Technical support (documentation and resources during development; h/w or s/w help; e.g. configuring servers, installing software)	No	Limited to coordination; limited development support	Yes for development	Yes	Yes
17	Testing (of module, of interface and network/system impacts)	Local	Local	Participant tested	AOC participation	AOC with local participation
18	Training (includes user and technical support training and documentation)	Local	Local	Participant training	Participant training with limited AOC involvement; AOC as repository for documentation.	AOC documents and performs as primarily field trainer training
19	Updates to core database (add, replace, delete of data in existing data structures)	No	With AOC approval	With AOC approval	Yes	Yes
20	User and training documentation	Local option	Local option	AOC as repository; Custodian maintains	AOC maintains	AOC maintains